

REMARKS

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 33-72 and 74-98 are now pending, of which claims 33, 46, 60, 68, 75, and 96 are independent.

Request for Interview

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.133, Applicant respectfully requests the courtesy of an interview with the Examiner prior to the issuance of another Office Action. Accordingly, if not already arranged, applicant asks that the Examiner contact the undersigned to arrange such an interview prior to entering an Office Action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 33, 36, 44, 49, 56, 58, 60, 61, 68, 69, 75, and 82-92 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that "'root' does not appear in any form in the specification, nor in the previous formations of the claims" and "[n]o references to said 'nested archive' appear in the specification or in the previous formations of the claims." See Office Action of September 4, 2007 at page 3, lines 7-8 and 11-12.

Applicant traverses this rejection. Applicant submits that support for the recited root archive and the recited nested archive is found in the application. For example, the application states:

Referring now to FIG. 5, depicted therein is a manifest file associated with a JAR file component as identified within manifest 400. Manifest file 504 is a manifest file for the component "mycomponent.jar" which is a JAVA archive. Accordingly, the present invention allows even JAR files and other type of archive files to be included within an archive containing all content necessary for a web site, or other web application. Accordingly, FIG. 5 clearly illustrates the recursive nature of the present invention to allow self-contained units to contain content formatted in accordance with a standard file format (i.e., .XJRs within .XJRs, etc.).

Application at page 13, lines 11-21.

Because the recited root archive and the recited nested archive are supported by the application, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 33, 36, 44, 49, 56, 58, 60, 61, 68, 69, 75, and 82-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60-64, 66-70, 72, and 74

Claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60-64, 66-70, 72, and 74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Developing Java Beans, O'Reilly (June 1997) (hereinafter Englander) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Englander in view of <http://java.sun.com/docs/books/tutorial/jar/basics/manifest.html> (hereinafter java.sun.com). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because Englander does not describe or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 33, 46, 60, 68, and 75, and java.sun.com does not remedy this deficiency of Englander.

Independent claim 33 recites a method for executing an application that is encapsulated in a package that includes a root archive of files that has an initial file and a manifest that has an initial file identifier that indicates that the initial file is to be processed before the other files in the root archive of files when the application is executed. The root archive of files includes an initial file that includes instructions for initiating execution of the application, other files needed to execute the application, and a nested archive that includes additional files. Among other features, the method includes loading the package within a browser, in response to loading the package within the browser, automatically accessing the manifest, locating the initial file identifier in the manifest, based on the located initial file identifier, accessing the instructions for initiating the execution of the application from the initial file, processing the accessed instructions, and automatically initiating execution of the application based on the processed instructions.

In rejecting independent claim 33 under both 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, the Office Action contends that the root archive corresponds to the "BeansBook.jar" file described by Englander. See Office Action of September 4, 2007 at page 4, lines 18-20 and at page 6, lines 4-

6. The Office Action also contends that the nested archive corresponds to the "Another.jar" file, which is rooted in "ARCHIVE." See Office Action of September 4, 2007 at page 5, lines 6-8 and at page 6, lines 8-13. While Englander explains that it is possible to specify more than one archive file using the "ARCHIVE" attribute referenced by the Office Action and illustrates the syntax for specifying two archive files using the "BeansBook.jar" and "Another.jar" files references by the Office Action, Englander does not describe or suggest that "Another.jar" is included in "BeansBook.jar" or that "BeansBook.jar" is included in "Another.jar." As such, Englander does not describe or suggest a root archive having a nested archive that includes additional files and that is included within a package.

Like Englander, java.sun.com also does not describe or suggest a root archive having a nested archive that includes other files and that is included within a package, nor does the Office Action contend that Englander does so. Therefore, none of Englander, java.sun.com, or any proper combination of Englander and java.sun.com describes or suggests a root archive having a nested archive that includes other files included within the package, as recited in independent claim 33. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 33 and its dependent claims 34, 36-39, 41, 42, and 44.

Independent claims 46, 60, and 68 recites features that are similar to those discussed above in connection with independent claim 33. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103(a) rejections of independent claims 46, 60, and 68 and their dependent claims 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 61-64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, and 74.

Claims 35 and 48

Dependent claim 35, which depends from independent claim 33, and dependent claim 48, which depends from independent claim 46, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,836 (hereinafter Rowe). However, Rowe does not cure the deficiencies in Englander noted above in connection with independent claim 33, nor does the Office Action contend that Rowe does so. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 35 and 48

at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 33.

Claims 40, 53, 65, and 71

Dependent claims 40, 53, 65, and 71, which depend from independent claims 33, 46, 60, and 68, respectively, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,877,766 (hereinafter Bates). However, Bates does not cure the deficiencies in Englander noted above in connection with independent claim 33, nor does the Office Action contend that Bates does so. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 40, 53, 65, and 71 at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 33.

Claims 43 and 56

Dependent claim 43, which depends from independent claim 33, and dependent claim 56, which depends from independent claim 46, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,617,526 (hereinafter Oran). However, Oran does not cure the deficiencies in Englander noted above in connection with independent claim 33, nor does the Office Action contend that Oran does so. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 43 and 56 at least because of their dependencies and the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 33.

Claims 75-77 and 79

Claims 75-77 and 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,024 (hereinafter Renshaw).

Independent claim 75 recites a web browser configured to receive and execute an application encapsulated in a self-contained package. Among other features, the web browser includes an input module for inputting a self-contained package that includes a root archive having a nested archive that includes other files and that is included within a package. As discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, Englander does not describe or

suggest a root archive having a nested archive that includes other files and that is included within a package. Like Englander, Renshaw also fails to describe or suggest a root archive having a nested archive that includes other files and that is included within a package. Rather, Renshaw describes a method and system for rendering embedded HTML documents in a visual display. See Renshaw at Abstract. Therefore, none of Englander, Renshaw, or any proper combination of Englander and Renshaw describes or suggests a web browser including an input module for inputting a self-contained package that includes a root archive having a nested archive that includes other files and that is included within a package, as recited in independent claim 75. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 75 and its dependent claims, claims 76, 77, and 79.

Claim 78

Dependent claim 78, which depends from independent claim 75, has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of Renshaw further in view of Bates. However, Bates does not cure the deficiencies in Englander and Renshaw noted above in connection with independent claim 75. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 78 at least because of its dependency and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 75.

Claims 80 and 81

Dependent claims 80 and 81, each of which depends from independent claim 75, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of Renshaw and further in view of Rowe. However, Rowe does not cure the deficiencies in Englander and Renshaw noted above in connection with independent claim 75. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 80 and 81 at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 75.

New Claims

Claims 93-98

New claims 93-95 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 33 and 60. Accordingly, because of their dependencies and the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, applicant submits that claims 93-95 are allowable.

New independent claim 96 recites a method for executing an application. Applicant submits that new independent claim 96, and its dependent claim 97 and 98, are allowable because the references of record fail to describe or suggest all of the features of new independent claim 96.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Daniel P. Veditz
Serial No. : 09/163,041
Filed : September 29, 1998
Page : 24 of 24

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-721001 / 97-870

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/31/2007



Hussein Akhavanik
Reg. No. 59,347

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40453352.doc